



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

COPY MAILED

DEC 09 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

HOWSON & HOWSON LLP
501 OFFICE CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 210
FORT WASHINGTON PA 19034

In re Patent No. 7,516,692 :
Issued: April 14, 2009 :
Application No. 10/781,174 : PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Filed: February 18, 2004 :
Dkt. No.: TOT7USA :

This is a decision on the "REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT 37 C.F.R. § 1.705(d)," filed April 22, 2009. Patentee requests correction of the patent term adjustment from 748 days to 1,086 days. Patentee requests this correction on the sole basis that the Office took in excess of three years to issue the above-referenced patent.

On July 7, 2009, patentee requested that a decision on this request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment be deferred or delayed until a final decision is rendered in Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008). There is no specific regulatory provision for requesting that a petition under 37 CFR 1.705(d) be held in abeyance. Accordingly, the request to hold in abeyance a decision on the merits of the instant application for patent term adjustment is **DISMISSED**.

The application for patent term adjustment (PTA) under 37 CFR 1.705(d) is **DISMISSED**.

The above-identified application matured into U.S. Pat. No. 7,516,692 on April 14, 2009. The patent issued with a patent term adjustment of 748 days. Patentee argues that in view of Wyeth v. Dudas, No. 07-1492 (D.D.C. Sept. 30, 2008), the patent is entitled to an adjustment of 1,086 days (781 days pursuant to 35 USC 154(b)(1)(A) *plus* 338 days pursuant to 35 USC 154(b)(1)(B) *less* 33 days of applicant delay).

Under 37 CFR 1.703(f), patentees are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR 1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which patentees failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704. In other words, patentees are entitled to the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay.

The Office asserts that as of the filing of the request for continued examination (RCE) on May 12, 2008, the application was pending three years and 448 days after its filing date (February 19, 2007 to May 11, 2008). The Office agrees that certain action was not taken within the specified time frame, and thus, the entry of a period of adjustment of 781 days is correct. At issue is whether patentees should accrue 448 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in

excess of three years to issue the patent, as well as 781 days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that the period of 448 days of delay in issuing the patent overlaps with the 781 days of examination delay under 37 CFR 1.702(a). Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

To the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f)*¹ and of the *United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 54366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004).

Further, as stated in the *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f)* and of the *United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending

¹ Likewise, 37 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay “overlap” under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay “overlap” under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the period during which the application was pending before the Office beginning on the application filing date under 35 U.S.C. 111(a), February 18, 2004, and ending on May 11, 2008, the day before the date that the RCE was filed on May 12, 2008.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) and 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1), 781 days of patent term adjustment were accorded during the pendency of the application for Office delay prior to the filing of the RCE. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) and 37 CFR 1.702(b), 448 days of patent term adjustment accrued at the time of submission of the RCE for Office issuance of the patent more than three years after the application filing date.


The 448 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(b) overlaps with the 781 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1). Entry of both the 448 days and the 781 days is neither permitted nor warranted given that 781 days is the actual number of days issuance of the patent was delayed at the time of submission of the RCE.

Accordingly, at issuance, the Office properly entered 748 days of patent term adjustment, having considered the 448 days of Office delay under the three-year pendency provision in conjunction with the 781 days of delay under 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1), reduced 33 days for applicants’ delay.

In view thereof, no adjustment to the patent term will be made.

No additional fees are due in connection with this matter.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.



Alesia M. Brown
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions